



Ms E. Roelofsen
1870 Neil St.,
Victoria, BC
V8R 3C7

2002 10 16.

National Institute of Standards &
Technology, Weights &
Measures
Laws and Metric Group.
100 Bureau Drive MS 2000,
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899-2000.

Gentlemen,

Re: Public Forum 2002 1107.

I was very pleased to receive from Ms Lorelle Young, Pres. of USMA, the announcement and particulars concerning the above forum.

Although I am unable to attend, I hope you will take my writings into consideration, although I live in Canada, or maybe just Because of that.

From '80 to '84 I was Metric chair of the British Columbia chapter of the Consumer's Association of Canada, and attended during those years several meetings of the sector committees of the CMM as well as those of the Provincial Metric office, i.e. Scales in the retail food industry; Consumers, home ec. & retailing; steering comm. Food Packaging; Beverages. I have also written close to a thousand letters personally, between 1976 and the present. All are on file together with many documents and articles.

I am sure your offices are aware of the 'derailing' of the process during 1980 and again during '83/4 for strictly political reasons following the changes from liberal to Conservative to liberal and again Conservative Fed. Government within five years time, resulting in the decision to "let the marketplace decide the process" without any interfering of the government, not even warning grocery stores who advertise in per pound prices only, despite the scales at the check-out being 99% in kilogram. This is against the 'rulings', but nothing is being done about it. After 22 years meat, produce are still advertised in huge /lb and tiny /kg prices or only /lb ones. Not only does this cost time and money for the retailers, does it not teach the consumer anything about metric & confuses the generation younger than 35, but also gives the overall impression that "IT DOES NOT MATTER". This attitude has a detrimental effect on the building industry which had announced to go fully Metric SI by January 1, 1978 !!!!! and still is not, beyond the provincial and municipal bylaws, land registry, official land maps etc.

What really scares me in the particulars of your forum are the words "voluntary" and "option".. If this is going to be accepted the US Government better look at Canada. One more point: sizes such as 120 g, 213 g, 170 g (all seafood) or 284 ml, 398 ml, 341 ml, 213 ml etc. (vegetables canned) don't mean anything in Metric countries, nor do they teach those, who have to accept the system, anything.

Many of our troubles are a result of the assumption that " the United States aren't going Metric"!!!!

Please, let common sense prevail. I hope to be informed of the final decisions.
Thank you.

Sincerely

cc. USMA

The Hon Allan Rock Min. of Industry Canada.

Feb. 3 '77

American Psychological Association: If the goal is to get people to think metric rather than keep converting conventional to metric, dual labelling may be an expensive step.

Alan Harper, Ex. member Australian Metric Board: The most effective way to help people think metric is to immerse them in the metric system and to avoid reference to the imperial system of measurement. Dual markings delay the learning process.

Dr. H. L. Prekel, South African Bureau of Standards: Dual marking has the effect of retarding understanding of metric system. Dual labelling is not permitted in S. Afr. and this has proved to be one of the most successful ways to get people to think in metric terms.

J. C. Graham, the Board appealed to the media to show measurements in metric only since people will not learn the measures while given the old ones along side as an alternative.

In Britain where dual is still used and where completion was supposed to have been in 1975 it is still muddling with two systems having packaged goods with metric only and selling weighed out goods in pounds and ounces.